



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/619,123	07/19/2000	Alice M. Chiang	2008-1001-018	1997
30407	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
BOWDITCH & DEWEY, LLP 311 MAIN STREET P.O. BOX 15156 WORCESTER, MA 01615-0156			JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/619,123

Applicant(s)

CHIANG ET AL.

Examiner

Jaworski Francis J.

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-74 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 75-94 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 – 74 stand withdrawn from consideration in this case pursuant to earlier election. Claims 75 – 86 are under examination in this case.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

[Parenthesized claim numbers pertain to the specific claim or claims being addressed by the immediately preceding rejection argument.]

Claims 75-77 and 87-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Daigle (US 5127409) in view of Shinomura et al (US5295485) and Mallart. (US5184623).

Daigle teaches an ultrasonic imaging system including an annular array probe 161-163, a PC platform for which a CPU is inherent in the definition of a personal computer which effects operational software as described in cols. 11 – 12, signal processing software for performing multi-dimensional Doppler processing (see col. 12 lines 10 – 20) as well as software scan conversion, see col. 12 lines 38 – 64, and display processing and display software for display on linear or sector array scanning system such as Daigle with a weight under 10 pounds, see col. 14. It would have been further obvious in view of Mallart col. 2 lines 3-26 that a multi-channel array would input

Art Unit: 3737

to the beamformer since from 16 – 64 elements are typically needed to form the aperture for the scan to take place.(Claims 75, 77)..

Memory is present in terms of RF memory 211-213characterizable as part of the PC platform per col. 10 line 63 – col. 11 line 5 for example. (Claim 76).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 78-80, 82, 84 –85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daigle (US5127409) in view of shinomura et al and Mallart, further in view of Blackwell et al (US5173837).

The former is applied as against claim 75, with additional note that the aforementioned RF memory constitutes a digital buffer memory for effecting a delay and forward function. Daigle does not speak to the weight of the personal computer unit. However, it would have been obvious in view of Blackwell et al to use a PC weighing less than ten pounds because this facilitates maximal portability and productivity (see col. 1 lines 14-27) as these would have been advantageous in a clinical environment. (Claims 78, 84).

Daigle further notes in col.. 12 lines 41 – 43 that scan conversion was conventionally practiced in both hardware and software hence having a circuit associated with the scan conversion would have been conventional. (Claim 79).

Art Unit: 3737

PC controls extend to the beamformer, see col. 11 lines 47 – 58. (Claim 80).

In Blackwell et al display 14, 16 is a flat panel display which contributes to the aforementioned portability and productivity. (Claim 82).

In Blackwell et al the battery-powered operation described in col. 1 lines 17 – 22 also this supports portability.(Claim 85).

Claim 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daigle in view of Shinomura et al and Mallart, further view of Blackwell et al as applied to claim 78 above, and further in view of Dubil et al (US4110835). Whereas the former is silent as to charge domain processing, it would have been obvious in view of the latter col. 2 lines 9 – 14 and 44 – 52 to utilize charge domain processing in a beamformer in order to avoid signal distortion and dynamic range reductions. (claim 81).

In view of Shinomura et al and Mallart, as applied to claim 75 above, and further in view of Wilson et al (US4471785).

The former is applied as above but is silent as to for example adaptive resolution enhancement based upon imaged data. However it would have been obvious in view of Wilson et al to adaptively control delay channels 66 in a beamformer via a central controller microcomputer 128 in order to improve image resolution by correcting for actual measured inhomogeneities in the image. (Claim 83).

Claim 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 75 above, and further in view of Blackwell et al and Cannon et al (US5423086).

Art Unit: 3737

The former are applied as above, that is, Blackwell et al supporting the extension of the Daigle PC system to laptop variants in view of light weight and portability of the latter. However, it would have been obvious in view of Cannon et al Fig. 1 to provide a wireless mode for a PC such as a laptop PC in order to further enhance versatility. (Claim 86).


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj

06252005



Francis J. Jaworski
Primary Examiner